DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 666 HE 001 564

TITLE	University, Government, and the Foreign Graduate Student; A Summary of the Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, Held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 30-31, 1967.
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	60p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College Entrance Examination Board, Publications Order Office, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adjustment Problems, Federal Government, *Federal Programs, *Foreign Students, *Graduate Students, *Graduate Study, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, International Education, Problems

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains a summary of the colloquium discussion including the major observations and recommendations, and three of the papers that were presented. The colloquium discussion focussed on a number of broad questions in relation to foreign graduate student programs: (1) prospects, assumptions, policies; and responsibilities from the standpoint of the graduate school; (2) the interplay in such programs between the university, on the one hand, and the government and other sponsoring agencies on the other; (3) problems of how relevant data might better be collected, processed and disseminated to improve the selection and screening of foreign graduate students; and (4) ways in which university policies in this area can be defined and communicated. The papers included in this volume are: "The Foreign Graduate Student: Old Assumptions, New Questions" by George P. Springer, "University and Government: The Views of the Foreign Graduate Student" by Daly C. Lavergne, and "An Appraisal of the Behavior of Universities in International Education" by Albert G. Sims. A list of the participants in the colloquium is included. (AF)

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY, U. S. A.
FORM 0801

ED040666

University, Government, *and the* Foreign Graduate Student

A Summary of the Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, Held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 30-31, 1967

Sponsored by:

The Council of Graduate Schools

in Association with

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

College Entrance Examination Board

Institute of International Education

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY CEEB
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE001 564

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1969

Copies of this booklet can be obtained from College Entrance Examination Board, Publications Order Office, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $1.25.

Inquiries regarding this booklet should be addressed to Editorial Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

Copyright © 1969 by College Entrance Examination Board

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 75–91599

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Introduction
1

Summary of the Colloquium Discussion: Major Observations and Recommendations. By Albert G. Sims
3

The Foreign Graduate Student: Old Assumptions, New Questions. By George P. Springer
8

University and Government: Two Views of the Foreign Graduate Student. By Daly C. Lavergne
28

An Appraisal of the Behavior of Universities in International Education. By Albert G. Sims
49

Participants in the Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, March 30–31, 1967
55

Introduction

The Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, held at Wingspread in Racine, Wisconsin, March 30–31, 1967, was sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools in association with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Institute of International Education, and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, with assistance from the United States Department of State and the Johnson Foundation. The sponsors of the colloquium are grateful to both these organizations for their support. The facilities at Wingspread and the hospitality of the Johnson Foundation were especially congenial to the purposes of the meeting. Thanks are due the Foundation, especially as hosts, for the warmth and excellence of their services.

About half of the more than 100,000 foreign students in the United States are graduate students. Trends suggest that this proportion will increase. Foreign-student advisers, admissions officers, English teachers, and others at United States institutions have been turning their attention more systematically to the many problems arising with this growing population of students from abroad. The graduate deans and the Council of Graduate Schools have inevitably become more involved in this process. More than 7 percent of United States graduate school enrollments is accounted for by students from abroad (contrasting with about 1 percent of the total undergraduate enrollments).

Working with organizations like the Institute of International Education and the African American Institute, and programs such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Council of Graduate Schools has made efforts to improve the quality of foreign graduate student exchanges. But the nature of United States graduate schools and their organization is such that it has been difficult for us associated with them to assess our situation in any systematic way, to share our experience, and to formulate general conclusions and policies relating to the foreign graduate student. The time is upon us when as a graduate school community we can in good conscience no longer neglect these concerns.

The meeting at Wingspread represented a constructive beginning. Most of the participants were graduate deans. The deans also had, however, the benefit of stimulation and advice from representatives of the four associated organizations, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Department of State, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This report includes a summary of the discussion of the participants, giving their major observations and recommendations. Also included are three papers from which much of the discussion developed. A list of the colloquium participants appears at the end of the report.

Although, unfortunately, considerable time has elapsed since the conclusion of the colloquium the sponsoring organizations believe that the substance of this meeting, as given in the report, is in most respects at least as relevant now as it was at the time of the conference. We therefore expect to make wide distribution of this report and hope that it will lead to the further refinement of policies and interests for the benefit of the graduate schools and the foreign students who are so vital a part of their constituency.

J. Boyd Page
Vice President for Research and
Dean of the Graduate College, Iowa State University

Chairman of the Colloquium

April 1969

Summary of the Colloquium Discussion: Major Observations and Recommendations

The discussion developed over a two-day period. Papers prepared by George P. Springer of the University of New Mexico and Daly C. Lavergne of the Agency for International Development were relevant background for discussion. Joseph E. Black of the Rockefeller Foundation gave some illuminating advice to the participants in his informal remarks based on his experience at the University of Ibadan in Nigeria. Albert G. Sims of the College Entrance Examination Board read a paper at another luncheon session of the colloquium. The papers by Springer, Lavergne, and Sims are reproduced as a part of this report.

The colloquium discussion focused on a number of broad questions in relation to foreign graduate student programs—prospects, assumptions, policies, and responsibilities from the standpoint of the graduate schools; the interplay in such programs between the university, on the one hand, and the government and other sponsoring agencies on the other; problems of how relevant data might be better collected, processed, and disseminated to improve the selection and screening of foreign graduate students; how policies of universities in this field can be defined and communicated, and so forth. During the colloquium Theodore Vestal of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed the provisions and status of the International Education Act.

Deans E. James Archer (University of Colorado), Robert H. Baker (Northwestern University), Francis M. Boddy (University of Minnesota), Howard S. Bretsch (University of Michigan), Harold Howe (St. Louis University), and John L. Landgraf (New York University) summarized the outcome of the colloquium discussion. The observations, conclusions, and recommendations given below are drawn from their reports.

(1) Foreign graduate students sponsored as a part of an institution-to-institution arrangement have the best possibility of being matched to an appropriate United States institution and of getting an educational pro-

---

by Albert G. Sims
Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board

gram appropriate to their interests and their country's needs. It is likely in such arrangements that the United States university has faculty working abroad with the counterpart foreign university. The student in such an exchange is typically selected for a specific purpose from the standpoint of the foreign university or agency abroad. He usually has a post already identified to which he will return. In the selection process abroad there is knowledge of the United States institution to assure a good program fit. Not all these potential advantages are fully realized in all such arrangements, but this is generally the best model for foreign graduate student programs involving objectives held mutually by the institutions and governments involved.

(2) Foreign graduate students who come as a part of such mutual arrangements are often junior faculty members in their own institutions, coming to the United States to get the kind of advanced training that is not available in their home country. They are thus being thrust from a position of relatively high status in their own country to one of relatively low status in the United States academic scene. In the circumstances it is highly important to provide adequate student services and support. It is desirable in the case of students coming for programs of two or more years that financing arrangements include the family of the student as well as the student. It should be recognized that while the student may speak English adequately other members of his family often do not. Unless the university is organized to help in such situations, the student may find himself assuming a heavy extra burden in caring for his family.

(3) The young foreign faculty member who is a student in the United States is typically relatively inexperienced in the academic setting at home. As time goes on he begins to worry about his status in his home country. Do they still want him? What developments and changes may be taking place in his department at home? Both student and United States institution have an urgent need for good lines of communication on such matters in order to maintain the confidence of the student and to assure the relevance of the United States institution's advice.

(4) The growth in international programs and foreign graduate exchanges is beginning to pose for the universities the kinds of questions that have been raised since World War II about the university's role and organization in relation to research. The policies, controls, and machinery that may be necessary as a response to these questions will obviously differ with institutions. The first step in approaching this problem is to identify the questions that the institution should confront. Most general and important for the university as a matter of policy is the question of

institutional role and function. The international connections of the university develop from a variety of levels, from numerous departmental activities, from external inducements and pressures. In the larger universities these connections are on such a scale that without a framework of conscious and deliberate policy they can become in their aggregate the inadvertent and perhaps unwise expression of policies of major import to the institution. The potential for the university in this range of activities shaped by rational policies is very great. Through international activities, the university's curriculum may be strengthened; faculty confidence and competence enhanced; the laboratory opportunities especially in the social sciences widely extended; and opportunities for students made more attractive.

Policy questions to be resolved more specifically include the extent to which the institution will specialize, if at all, by geographic areas; criteria for the acceptance or rejection of grants and contracts; admissions and financial aid policies and policies with respect to foreign student services; and most important, how the institution makes policies and communicates them on all such matters. The qualities of independence and freedom for researchers and teachers are important considerations that put constraints upon any institutional impulse for neat and precise policy determinations in this field. Yet both freedom and coherence can be accommodated in a web of policy making that identifies and interrelates the right questions.

(5) Does the United States university have an obligation to treat the foreign graduate student academically in any special way in the light of his particular circumstances and needs? "Special treatment" can be interpreted to mean more flexible application of grading standards (a double standard) and perhaps the provision of courses and programs designed to meet the foreign student's particular needs. The participants recognized that a double standard is an unacceptable and inequitable institutional practice. They were also aware, however, that it is in the nature of the human situation involving faculty and foreign graduate students for judgments occasionally to be affected by the special circumstances confronting foreign students. Most participants thought that the development of curriculums tailored for foreign students were generally infeasible for the majority of United States institutions. Careful course planning with competent academic advice can help substantially in meeting the foreign student's needs academically.

(6) There was general agreement on the importance of careful evaluation in the selection and admission of foreign graduate students. Weak-

ness in the admissions process invites the double-standard problem. Institutions receiving applications from sponsoring public and private agencies sometimes sense that they are expected, if not obliged, to admit the applicants involved. Neither universities nor agencies should have such expectations. Applications received through such channels or otherwise should be recommended for referral to other universities when that would be more appropriate.

(7) The current mechanism and procedures for collecting, analyzing, and distributing data concerning international education, especially those important for the evaluative process in admissions, should be improved. Springer's proposal would not be easy to implement, but most participants believed that further attention should be given to the development of computer-based information systems. More systematic analysis and appraisal of the data of universities' experience with foreign graduate students would also be highly useful.

(8) The university must have a "critical mass" of foreign students in order to gain perspective, set its goals, marshal its resources, and evaluate its efforts. It would be impossible for a university with a handful of students from a few scattered countries to have a program of significant impact on its role or objectives.

(9) Some saw tension and conflict between the emphasis in Lavergne's paper on the need for graduate schools to respond to the more current and urgent problems of development, on the one hand, and his stress on defining long-range university goals, policies, and commitments. Response to current needs implies the university's willingness, ad hoc, to meet the demands of agencies such as AID. But deliberate long-term policy making by the university in this field suggests the delineation of the institutional role, the capacity to select what is and what is not in the institutional interest. Long-term commitment implies substantial funds for the development of basic resources in the university. Yet it is apparent that funds for such purposes are not forthcoming from government or from foundations. This is the kind of dilemma the universities now face, making development of sound policies and wise commitments very difficult indeed.

(10) Assuming that the mediation of this conflict (described in the above paragraph) is in the collective interest of both the universities and the government, the question was posed: Is there a need for a focal point in Washington through which the universities and federal agencies might cooperate meaningfully on both policy and operational terms in the field of international education?

(11) One commentator noted the parochial and missionary aspects of United States graduate education—its Western-based ideology, its orientation toward individualism, "the whole existential business of the individual determining for himself what truth is," its culture-laden concepts of "the educated man," and so forth. These are some of the implicit assumptions that should be kept in mind when considering the university's role and responsibility with respect to foreign graduate students.

Four quite specific recommendations emerged from the colloquium discussion. They are as follows:

(1) The inclusion of a representative sample of 5 to 10 percent from abroad among graduate student bodies is a desirable policy objective for both the nation and the universities. Selection of these students should take account of the need for enhancing individual opportunities, for promoting institutional development, and for supporting the economic and cultural aims of the foreign countries.

(2) Agencies and organizations that deal with universities and students abroad should make special efforts to orient the prospective exchange student to the systems of United States education and in particular to the hazards of the American doctoral programs—programs in which many start and only a few finish. The peculiarities of the American examination system deserve special emphasis in this context.

(3) It is the consensus of the conference that the double standard for either admission or qualification for degrees has no justification in the university. Pressure for relaxation of standards would be eased if the exchange agencies were to present their candidates with clear statements that they are seeking the best matching of educational facilities and student objectives. They should state in writing that alternate institutions will be sought if there is any doubt of such matching in a particular university.

(4) The changing patterns of graduate financial aid toward gift stipends for American nationals work to the disadvantage of foreign students. If the student-body proportion of foreign students earlier recommended is to be maintained, foreign graduate students must have more access to fellowships. This burden cannot be borne by the universities alone. Nor should it, in the national interest. It is therefore recommended that funds be sought to support approximately 2,000 foreign student graduate fellowships a year, the fellowships to be distributed *en bloc* on a pattern similar to that currently used for the selection of fellows in programs such as those under the National Defense Education Act.

The Foreign Graduate Student: Old Assumptions, New Questions[1]

"In comparison with the sophisticated study and analysis devoted to United States military, economic, or diplomatic policy, little systematic intellectual attention is given to educational and cultural policy." (Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Department of State[2])

Introduction and Definitions

It has long been sound academic practice to begin a paper with a review of working definitions, and I propose to follow this practice in respect to the subject of this paper. There has never been great clarity in the concept of "graduate student," and the most recent statistics issued by the Institute of International Education (IIE) indicate some troubles with the definition of "foreign student."[3]

A graduate student, narrowly defined, is a student enrolled in a graduate school, but two facts tend to undermine the administrative neatness of this concept: (1) graduate schools in North America are characterized by a great diversity in the boundaries they set for their jurisdictions over fields of study; and (2) statistics in respect to foreign graduate students do not normally distinguish between graduate and professional students working for second- and third-level degrees. For both reasons, it seems preferable to give the concept of "graduate student" a broad definition for the purposes of this discussion and to embrace such fields as engineering, business administration, education, as well as the medical

1. The author gratefully acknowledges the suggestions of his friends—Jeanne Brockmann, James L. Colwell, John Perry Miller, Richard C. Raymond, J. Morgan Swope, and Theresa Connelly Whiting.

2. "New Initiatives in International Education," *Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 79th Annual Convention, 1965*. P. 22.

3. *Open Doors 1966*. New York: The Institute of International Education, p. 5. At present, students declaring an intent not to return home are excluded from IIE's statistical breakdown. In future statistical reports, these students will be counted.

by George P. Springer
Dean, Graduate School, University of New Mexico

and legal sciences, regardless of decanal jurisdictions, so long as the training provided occurs at the postbaccalaureate level.

In regard to the term "foreign," to say that a foreign student is one who technically is an alien, is a tautology. Moreover, the simple dichotomy citizen-alien ignores several categories that apply to nationals of United States possessions or trusteeships, Cuban parolees, and other aliens in permanent residence. All these categories are of concern to lawmakers, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the campus foreign student adviser, and all traineeship- and fellowship-granting agencies of the United States government. Worse yet, a legalistic approach to "foreign" conceals what is at the core of the concept—the quality of foreignness. This is the quality, after all, that concerns us at this meeting, that creates many of the fascinations and problems we wish to discuss. This quality is susceptible to no simple administrative demarcation lines. In fact, those of us involved in the administration of graduate education often wonder about the relevance of the whole question of citizenship to educational matters. We have learned, for instance, that most Canadian students who normally constitute the largest single block of foreign students in the United States, characteristically uphold and improve our academic standards, while a native-born Spanish-American or Indian characteristically fails to meet them. From the university's point of view, it may actually be true that what is relevant in "foreignness" is not a passport but a set of socioeconomic, intellectual, and linguistic qualifications that defy citizenship classifications. Let me amplify this point.

Social anthropologists and psychologists have successfully developed the notions of cultural distance and culture shock, and applied these to foreign-student situations. I believe that these same notions apply to graduate education as a whole, a system once described by Jacques Barzun as an "amiable anarchy." United States graduate schools, their students, professors, administrators, and other staff constitute a distinct culture in terms of values, written and common laws, rewards and punishments, distinct subcultures, rituals, fetishes, and taboos. Anyone approaching a graduate school from the outside for the first time is met with surprises. To become a successful participant in this culture takes certain talents for students and teachers alike, such as adaptability, motivation, proficiency in certain fields, and a modicum of intellectual curiosity. These talents grow more easily in a middle-class urban home than in a peasant hut, the bush, the pueblo, or the urban slum. Many United States citizens lack these talents, through no fault of their own, while some foreign students possess them, through no credit of their own.

This situation has at least two implications: First, there is much similarity between the cultural distance that must be bridged by many domestic and foreign students alike to assimilate successfully the peculiar culture of an American graduate school. Second, the old ideal of regarding a foreign student principally as a student, and only when absolutely necessary as foreign, retains a great deal of merit from a university's point of view. It can be argued that in the whole spectrum of academic, personal, and financial problems that characteristically beset all graduate students, the foreign student's problems can be accommodated, as a special variant, because "foreignness" is a quality endemic in a good many underprivileged United States citizens. More and more universities are taking an active interest in the latter by providing special enrichment programs and tutoring, using some of the same techniques developed in orientation programs for foreign students. At my university there are several Pueblo Indian, Navajo, and Spanish-American students enrolled in the course of remedial English especially designed for foreign students.

With these reservations made, a foreign graduate student can then be defined as a student from abroad who is potentially or actually enrolled in an American institution at a level above the first degree. Included in this definition are law, business, and medical students as well as special students considered to have accomplished the equivalent of this country's first-level degrees.

Statistical Perspective

An examination of a set of basic statistics shows that in the academic year 1965–66, for instance, there were some 93,700 foreign students in the United States.[4] Of this number, about 11,000 had evidently declared an intention to remain in the United States and therefore were excluded from further statistical treatment in the report. Of the remaining 82,700, 44 percent or 36,335 were graduate students, and the rest were undergraduate, special, or unclassified students. The 44 percent figure for graduate students reflects the highest proportion reached in at least a decade and continues a trend away from undergraduate training toward graduate specialization. By comparison, 10 years earlier only 37 percent were reported to be graduate students. Graduate students predominate numerically in the physical sciences, agriculture, the social sciences, and education, while undergraduates predominate in the other fields.

---

4. *Ibid.*

If one relates the foreign-student figures to total United States enrollments for the same year, several interesting facts emerge. In 1965–66 total enrollment in institutions of higher education had passed the five million mark. In this mass, all foreign students constituted only 1.7 percent. On a national scale, in the same academic year graduate students numbered half a million, or roughly 10 percent of total enrollment in higher education. In this group, the 36,335 foreign graduate students constitute 7.2 percent. Thus, compared to the undergraduate "mix," which is only 0.85 percent, the graduate mix is quite potent. Still, compared to the foreign-domestic mix of European host countries such as Britain (11 percent), France (10 percent), the Soviet Union (8 percent), and West Germany (7.2 percent), the United States overall mix of 1.7 percent is rather feeble. Therefore, the problems of foreign students here should be more easily managed for purely numerical reasons. But they are more easily managed in the United States also for other reasons, thanks to the stringent visa control exercised by our government compared to West European governments. Despite local concentrations of foreign students on relatively few campuses (Woodbury College, Los Angeles, 19 percent; Howard University, 14.4 percent; M.I.T., 12.5 percent; Columbia, 10.1 percent; Yale, 9 percent), most United States colleges and universities find themselves blessed with between 2 and 7 percent foreigners in the total student body. In the view of most administrators, this constitutes a desirable leavening of the total student body. Policies governing the extent of such leavening are discussed later in this paper. In view of the small overall percentage of foreign students in the United States, one might well ask why highly elaborate special policies and procedures are necessary to cope with their problems. I hope to demonstrate in this paper that in some respects all concerned are better served if special arrangements are held to a minimum, and if policies are determined by the same university officials who develop such procedures and policies for domestic students.

Untested Assumptions

More difficult than a consideration of the major policy questions about the foreign graduate student are three old, untested assumptions that underlie study experiences abroad. The first is that, other things being equal, graduate study abroad can be more rewarding than undergraduate study; inversely, undergraduate study abroad has often been described as subverting the barely formed values the immature foreign student attaches to his home culture. A second frequently cited assumption is that

foreign study is beneficial and necessary in the national interest, since it contributes to international understanding, as well as to an individual's greater proficiency in his chosen field. A third assumption is that there exists a community of interests among all parties involved in student exchanges: the student, the government, the university, and the financial sponsor.

There is some evidence that these assumptions, like political campaign cliches, are too glibly perpetuated. In fact, it may well be time to challenge them, in the absence of the kind of proof that only longitudinal studies, follow-up, and legitimate social science techniques can provide.

Assumption 1: Pending further evidence, would it not be sounder to declare that foreign graduate study is beneficial for a chosen few, provided certain interlocking conditions such as a good match between student and institution, adequate financial aid and realistic professional goals can be met, and that if they cannot be met, foreign graduate study results in disappointment? It has never been demonstrated whether foreign study dispels or reinforces certain stereotyped prejudices existing in visitor and host alike merely by virtue of the visitor's attending a college or university; or, that attitude changes are more noticeable in students than in businessmen, sportsmen, or military personnel, who may also find themselves staying abroad for extended periods of time.

Assumption 2: Judging by limited personal experience, I have found reason to doubt the assumption that foreign study generally promotes friendship between governments. First of all, it may actually promote disappointment in individuals. For instance, a fairly sophisticated Soviet graduate student in the United States tends to find certain of his suspicions confirmed: that most of his American peers lack his seriousness, a concern for social and international issues, an understanding of true personal friendship; that nonacademic citizens are predominantly hedonists, read very little of consequence, lack appreciation of good art and music, and are often naive and prejudiced about people who differ from themselves. In the light of this particular experience, and in terms of "international good will," there is a possibility that had this foreign graduate student never seen the United States in person he might have developed a more favorable attitude purely on his suspicion that what his own government told him about the United States may have been negatively colored. An African student involved in a racial incident here may have been better off without an exposure to such an indignity in our country. Nehru and many of the other architects of Indian independence were the products of Oxford and Cambridge, as Ayub Khan was a product of

Sandhurst. In fact the elite of the developing countries of Asia and Africa are largely Western-trained, but in the international arena often speak and act generally anti-Western. The Soviet Union and other neighbors to the West have experienced similar disappointments with foreign students. And the fact that the German occupation of Norway during World War II was facilitated by former foreign students has been cited before in an attempt to undermine the assumption that international goodwill must grow through student exchanges.

As suggested by Charles Frankel, scholars should more energetically seek proof by some substantive research that the national interest is indeed being served through student exchanges.[5] Meanwhile, what is clear is that governments and their policies change. This is true of all nations, but it is particularly manifest in the developing nations from whence the United States now draws three quarters of its visiting graduate students. Lasting friendships between governments are rarer still than those between individuals, but in either case they are more likely achieved when the bases on which they rest are realistic rather than putative. University people ought to hold up their end of this hypothesis by disclaiming that they are qualified to assure the United States government of 10 years hence the friendship of a French, Nigerian, Indian, or Taiwanese graduate student of today, or that of his government 10 years hence.

Particularly today, when United States student activists are so critical of their government and society, we should be cautious in prognosticating international friendships. Though activism affects relatively few students on each campus, these students are usually vocal, articulate, and organized, and they may well affect the foreign student's views.

What we university people can claim with some confidence is that we offer certain forms of training that may have relevance to the foreign student's career objectives, or his government's manpower needs 10 years hence; that this country provides in the more than 250 universities that have graduate and professional schools a greater variety of educational offerings than any other nation on earth; and that we are happy to welcome, support, and train in regular and special programs qualified students without regard to race, creed, national background, citizenship, or political persuasion. If we take this attitude, we are less likely to delude ourselves in the long run about the political utility of exchanges, or about our ability to affect students' feelings, to second-guess their objectives, or please their respective governments.

---

5. Op. cit.

I am confident that the best results in hoped-for concomitants to the educational process are achieved when the focus remains on the educational process itself. So long as the foreign graduate student remains just a graduate student in the eyes of his university, rather than an object of special interest for reasons outside academe, possible disappointments over his subsequent actions will be on the same order as those evoked by a domestic student who may not work out, may become disaffected and angry with his institution. In summary then, I assert that we should never assume that our universities' interests totally overlap those of the United States government. Our first task at the graduate level is to educate and train people professionally. We can and should assume full responsibility for this aspect of the foreign student's stay, because we have control over it. For a graduate school this is a relatively short-term commitment that it is well able to honor. Any commitment relative to a foreign student that goes very far beyond this is likely to lead to situations a graduate school cannot or should not control. There are some limits to our capabilities that we should realize, verbalize, and emphasize.

Assumption 3: The discussion above relates to the third assumption to be challenged: that in foreign-student exchange there is a community of interest for all concerned. An analysis of this situation shows that there are always at least four discrete entities involved in any study-abroad situation: the student, his government, the host government, and the university in the host country. To this list it is possible to add two more interest groups that on occasion enter the picture: the independent sponsor (if neither of the first four parties provides financial support), and the home university (which may release an advanced student on condition that he return to a teaching post). A complete matching of interests among all these parties would be nothing short of a miracle. Under ideal conditions, there is no major conflict among these four to six agents, and some examples of excellent cooperation in joint financial sponsorships will be noted later. But among these six agents, the two principal ones, I would like to think, are the individual student and the host university. The governments, with all due respect, are there to facilitate and support individual travel for educational purposes as long as this travel is not clearly in conflict with national interest in the sense of creating a clear-cut danger to the nation. The withholding of passports and visas, the enforcement of unfair and unreasonable regulations (such as those necessitating a two-year separation of a newly wed J-visa wife from a United States husband) usually gain little support for a government. It should of course be recognized that laws and national interests do impinge on

international student travel. In the United States, the fact that foreign students must have visas has been of great help to all university admissions officers. Western European admissions people complain of never knowing which foreign students may be on their doorsteps next.

The concerns of the interested parties in student exchanges can be summarized as follows.

The student's interests are best served if he realizes at least five factors in advance: his career objectives and the job market for his chosen career; educational alternatives in the United States and elsewhere; his own capabilities judged on the basis of his own and the United States educational system; the cost of study abroad and how to meet it; the inherent difficulty of all graduate study, and the dropout rate among United States and foreign students.

The graduate school's interest in having a foreign student, aside from the general leavening effect, may be affected by the student's special competence or needs, by the fact that he has been carefully screened, or by the fact that he has financial support.

The independent financial sponsor's interests are served when he can place his candidates in the schools of their choice, such placement being tempered by his hard-earned experience in the art of the possible, and the feasibility of programs.

The home university has an interest in gaining a better trained individual. But it cannot demand a "blank check" guarantee of return (as is done in some countries) in place of a contract that includes an understanding about promotion or salary advance upon return.

Finally, *the two governments* also have legitimate interests that must be acknowledged. What can be said in general is that these interests are changeable and therefore should be often reviewed on both sides. These interests should be made quite explicit to potential students and interested universities.

In this connection, Senator Walter F. Mondale's expressed concern and that of many others about the brain drain is legitimate. I particularly favor the study of this complex problem that is now authorized under Title III of the International Education Act of 1966. Only if the problem is seen in its full perspective will it lead to sensible action: it ought to be recognized that brain power is highly mobile and has been so since the dawn of history; that there is similarity between brain-impelled upward social mobility, and "diagonally upward" mobility from one society to another; that urbanization is a world-wide manifestation of rural brain drain; and that governmental interests cannot and should not be too

strongly represented by the universities themselves in the whole question of the international brain drain.

Foreign governments whose students travel will have to realize that students going abroad to more highly developed nations learn a great deal more than what they set out to study, that a certain defection rate must be expected, and that the best way to counter it is by creating the information, atmosphere, and inducements that will bring the young people back voluntarily without bonds or other coercive measures.

Selection and Screening Processes

As long as students continue coming from abroad, the problem of providing an adequate two-way information system will be with us, because individual institutions and educational systems change constantly, and in the newer nations, very dynamically. In the direction "hither," this system must provide graduate deans and their admissions officers with better data on foreign schools, colleges, and universities, at least those that function as the major feeders of United States graduate schools. Such monumental efforts as Martena Sassnett's "bible" of 1952[6] and similar yearbooks, handbooks, and pamphlets should be constantly and rapidly updated as well as amplified if they are to be useful. I will suggest some ways below in which this effort could be launched.

In the direction "thither," the information system should provide detailed data on United States graduate schools, in order to facilitate more rational self-selection among foreign applicants and more efficient counseling by United States officials and representatives abroad.

Frankly, I foresee no practical way in which the multilateral decision-making in the application and selection processes can be centralized. The individual student, I believe, will typically continue to formulate his own judgments about where to apply in the United States; and graduate schools are unlikely to abandon their freedom of choice in admitting foreign applicants. But United States advisers abroad, whether they represent the International Institute of Education, the African American Institute or similar regional interest groups, or the United States government, would benefit tremendously from the availability of better data on graduate schools.

Yet, while the decision-making processes must remain decentralized, the data-gathering and distribution services could well be centralized. A

---

6. Martena Tenney Sassnett, *Educational Systems of the World*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1952.

data bank could be maintained by any one of the professionally concerned and competent private or public organizations in this country. I do not believe that such a data bank would present insurmountable technical problems in collection and dissemination, or in financing. The data problem is manageable simply because it is finite.

The criteria, after all, on which individual students base their decisions and by which admissions are typically offered by graduate schools, are limited in number. An analysis of typical student criteria would yield a list of perhaps 10 items an applicant considers in choosing graduate schools to apply to. The graduate schools in turn could disclose and disseminate their own selection criteria at home and abroad.

In the process of choosing a graduate school, a foreign applicant differs from a United States applicant only in his relative ignorance of available opportunities and chances for admission and financial aid. He will be guided by essentially the same set of criteria as will a United States applicant: (1) The reputation of the school and the academic department. (2) The possibility of financial aid. (3) A belief that his own talents provide him with an adequate chance for admission and financial aid, based on a knowledge that others with similar records from the same or similar schools have preceded him and have graduated. (4) Some assurance that the training offered in the United States will enhance his chances for a better career at home or elsewhere. (5) An expectation that a decent social existence will accompany a successful academic experience. (6) A hope that housing and food will be adequate and not in conflict with his tastes and religion. (7) Some certainty of the credits, if any, he will receive for work already done. (8) His positive assessment of the ease or difficulty of the normal academic hurdles and the time span with which they can be passed. (9) The cost of applications and required tests. (10) The courtesy with which the graduate schools respond to his correspondence.

Can't information on which such applicants' judgments are based be distributed abroad and constantly updated, for the existing 250 graduate schools? It would simply mean a certain amount of data processing annually to cover each graduate school's idiosyncrasies. Some of these facts can be culled from catalogs; others would have to be supplied by graduate deans or department chairmen. There are few internal secrets in the process as such. Most graduate schools record how many students, domestic or foreign, apply for each department each year, how many are offered admission, how many financial aid, of what sort and magnitude, how many are rejected, and why. Detailed graduate enrollment figures

are available for each level of graduate study, since the United States Office of Education demands them annually, and figures on the number of degrees awarded are available, since the National Academy of Science–National Research Council conducts a census every year.

These and similar data could be assembled, condensed, coded, card-punched, and printed out for very wide distribution abroad with the simple object of curtailing the masses of misdirected foreign applications. As a result, the uncontrolled flood now flowing into graduate admissions offices from Asia, Africa, and Latin America would assume more reasonable proportions.

Let me present a concrete example. I recall that for many years the quota of graduate students enrolled by the English department at Yale has been 40, in order to maintain a level of about 120 graduate students. Applications in 1966 were over 450. To gain 40 students, the graduate school would make some 65 offers. Simple arithmetic tells an applicant that his chances of being *accepted* are 1 in 7. At the University of New Mexico the English department has about 125 graduate students; in 1966 only 18 out of 138 applicants for the English department were rejected. So, purely by coincidence, the exact inverse ratio to Yale's obtains at New Mexico: the student's chance is only 1 in 7 of being *rejected*. I hasten to add that this is not simply a reflection of the different qualities in those two departments, but rather an expression of different institutional admissions policies: one is established by a highly selective, Ph.D.-oriented and internationally known private institution and the other by a permissive, young, M.A.-oriented state institution. But the point is that these policies can be made explicit, quantified, and disseminated. Similar statistics are available on departments everywhere. Other important figures could concern student-teacher ratios, men-women ratios, average times required for degrees, and financial aid statistics.

Of the two information flows, the one going abroad is, of course, the simpler, since it deals with a limited "corpus" of only 250 graduate schools. Assume that a graduate school contains, on the average, 50 departments offering graduate degrees, and that each department can be adequately described by 20 figures covering enrollments, degree production, admissions, financial aid, and desired minimum test scores. Add to this 20 general descriptive items on the graduate school and university including some of the information developed in the Cartter Report[7] in

---

7. Allan M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

carefully edited and condensed form. All these items together would make a total of five million bits of information annually.

Given today's computer technology, it would not be a difficult task to code, punch, print out, and distribute this information in perhaps 100,000 copies. The information could be stored on magnetic tape for the automatic production of five-year summaries. The Inter-University Communications Council, known as EDUCOM, is concerned with similar information networks. Medical libraries are pioneering in the area of automated cataloging and topical information retrieval. The Office of Education operates an Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) under its Bureau of Research, with regional clearinghouses throughout the country, and is expanding its activities into several new areas of education. There exist, therefore, on the scene today several programs whose central concern is the collection, processing, storing, retrieval, and dissemination of educational information.

In summary, I am simply advocating that universities and public and private agencies interested in international exchange of academic personnel should avail themselves of the new technology in an attack on the paucity of information that has hitherto characterized this process at both ends.

This suggestion is not made lightly, for I am aware of at least two problems. One is that although the processing and distribution of data is technologically simple, the collection of data will mean extra statistical work on some campuses where this type of information is not now routinely available. I believe, however, that any resistance to participating in a standardized process can be overcome by two arguments: that these data are of considerable internal value to campus planners and report writers; and that the benefits of disseminating more meaningful facts to domestic and foreign applicants outweigh the burden of internal data collection. The other problem is that certain graduate schools may be sensitive about disclosing certain data. Here again, a case can be made that advantages of better future self-selection outweigh the comforts of secrecy. Ultimately these schools will have to choose between being secretive and the cost of processing growing numbers of futile foreign, as well as domestic, applications.

Not for technological reasons, but for reasons of administrative underdevelopment, will the data-collection process be more difficult in the "hither" phase of the information flow, whereby graduate schools in this country (and perhaps in other host countries) are to be kept informed of the status of the foreign feeder colleges and universities their applicants

come from. Admissions officers in this country look for systematic information of two kinds, institutional and personal. In the institutional category they are concerned with curriculums, where faculty obtained their degrees, library and laboratory facilities, student-teacher ratios, and, if possible, past performance of alumni in overseas graduate schools. Institutional criteria are critically important, since they determine the value of individual performance indices. In addition to the usual credentials, the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and the Educational Testing Service tests for graduate, law, and business applicants have proved their predictive value; perhaps a battery of new tests specifically designed to fit the problems of foreign applicants from developing countries can be developed. I suspect that some of the tests being developed for disadvantaged students in this country may have a certain relevance to such test development.

To make the two-way information flow a reality, a panel consisting of experts in foreign-student admissions, testing, performance, and data processing should devise a comprehensive program, beginning with a feasibility study, and ending in a concrete proposal.

Collecting the required information from foreign feeder schools in developing countries is expected to present a serious problem not only because these schools are likely to be underdeveloped administratively but also because there are so many of them and because they vary so widely in system and history. This effort would be worthwhile to these feeder institutions, however, again for both internal and external reasons. To launch it, an international initiative would seem more propitious than a purely United States initiative. At the very least, the United States and Canadian graduate schools might pool their resources and initiate such a program through the Council of Graduate Schools and AGS. Ideally, however, the two dozen principal host countries that regularly receive many graduate students from the developing nations ought to form a consortium through the International Association of Universities, or Unesco, to sponsor this program. It almost goes without saying that the Soviet Union and the East European countries should not be excluded from this joint effort.

A panel of experts in international education supported by computer scientists and programers should study the most feasible methods of collecting, codifying, and distributing the information of importance to the receiving universities in the more advanced countries.

There is one additional use to which the "hither" information system could be put. As I stated above, one way to counteract the brain drain is

to provide the nationals studying abroad with information on job opportunities at home. In some rudimentary form, I believe, some foreign governments are already providing this information. Informal channels are also effective to some extent. However, a more systematic coverage, at least with respect to educational opportunities, could be achieved if it became a component of the other informational system on every United States campus. The foreign student adviser could then post the information on his bulletin board. The problem may be that some countries may not be ready to part with their more traditional forms of patronage, but one would hope that the universities at least would be willing to advertise their jobs and fill them competitively, on merit.

The emphasis I have placed on the establishment of the two-way paper information system does not imply that other, supplemental steps are not also called for. I am thinking primarily of field offices and roving teams of United States interviewers. There is a useful though limited history to these activities—for example, the African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU)—but I am not sure that a more thorough study of the general utility of these sporadic efforts is not called for. My own feeling for some years has been that despite the disadvantage to universities of having cultural affairs officers directly identified with the United States government and its policies, their ubiquity and potential service as educational counselors might be worth the price to United States higher education. However, as the original Bill for the International Education Act of 1966 suggested, a massive upgrading of the quality of personnel representing United States higher education abroad would have to be part of the bargain, before many graduate schools are likely to support it. Cultural affairs officers who do not speak the language of the country, never go to theater or concerts, never are seen at the national university, never mix with the local intellectuals, and have not read the local novelists and poets, simply cannot represent United States higher education abroad.

The roving United States professors interviewing applicants might become more useful if their activities were coordinated and supported in the field. However, I see many difficulties in obtaining qualified people for this activity on a continuing, rather than on a purely opportunistic, basis. At least in the past it has not been easy to persuade them to abandon their own objectives in favor of administrative duties on behalf of their own university or of a consortium. Precisely because the flow of information must be a chronic process if it is to be effective, the roving interviewers and selectors are viewed at best as supplementary to it.

Internal and External Institutional Organization

One of the perplexing questions has been the best means of organizing the campus to deal with foreign graduate students and manage international programs in general.

The university that deals with foreign students must provide (1) effective information dissemination, (2) rational admissions and financial aid procedures, (3) orientation for newly arrived students, (4) superior academic counseling, (5) advantageous arrangements for shelter and food, (6) appropriate efforts and guidance in social contacts, (7) help with legal questions involving the Immigration and Naturalization Service, (8) wise and humane career and predeparture counseling.

Two things are certain: one, that these functions must be performed; second, that most of them also pertain to domestic students. One thing is uncertain: how best to organize them. Because campus jurisdictions vary so greatly, and because of my basic notion that the foreignness of foreign students should not be overstated, I find it difficult to suggest an ideal universal setup. Looking at it selfishly, as a graduate dean, I can attempt an expression of preferences. First, I prefer to do some of the things listed above within my own jurisdiction: I believe that functions (1) through (4) can hardly be delegated out of the graduate school. The suggestions of Mark Peisch that foreign admissions are best centralized in the hands of a small, highly specialized staff of evaluators[8] may be valid for certain institutions. My own feeling is that every graduate admissions office should have at least one person knowledgeable in foreign credentials. But I doubt that such a person can also adequately cover the divergent needs and requirements of 50 academic departments, except in a consultative role.

The need for high competence in foreign languages and knowledge of comparative education systems, so crucial in graduate school admissions processes, may be reduced to the extent to which it might be possible to modernize the two-way information system outlined in the previous section. Printouts on foreign education systems and institutions should reduce the gap between domestic and foreign tasks and risks in admissions. If this reduction can be achieved, then the same people who normally handle admissions can be expected to handle foreign admissions as well. The same people who handle financial aid offers (usually chairmen for assistantships and graduate deans for fellowships and traineeships) can

---

8. *The Foreign Graduate Student at Twenty-Two American Universities.* New York: Columbia University, 1965, pp. 17–18.

handle those for foreign students as well. Many administrative complications can be alleviated or eliminated, if the foreign credentials become less foreign through increased knowledge of their meaning.

It seems to me that this is the way of the future: not to specialize and separate these processes, but to render them more familiar and adjustable to the normal processes used for 92.3 percent of all graduate students. I should not go so far as to argue for the systematic elimination of specialists such as the foreign student adviser, or director of international programs, and so on. Far from it. There are certain functions—(5) through (8) above—that they can best perform themselves or in combination with other service departments on campus. (Incidentally, as graduate dean, I would wish to have a say about certain policies that these offices adopt with respect to foreign graduate students!) In summary, therefore, I do not advocate a major internal realignment of responsibilities, but rather an occasional assessment of the efficiency of what is being done on campus.

An interesting question under the heading of campus organization concerns the relationship of international houses or clubs to the university. This is of particular importance to graduate and professional schools, because their foreign students tend to have more social and housing problems than the undergraduates and therefore need more support on that level. Again, patterns vary, but it is my feeling that a great potential community resource to the university is lost if the international house is controlled either by the university administration or the foreign students themselves, rather than by the community. The valuable work of dozens of competent volunteer workers from within the community is what makes all but the best-endowed international houses going concerns.

But the most important question of internal organization is that of policy making. Who is to determine the percentage of foreign graduate students, law students, medical students? Who is to determine whether special programs should be set up to serve foreign students? Who determines when standards are being impaired or improved by foreign students and calls for a policy review? Who develops positions *vis à vis* the Department of State, IIE, and similar organizations?

Again, two points have to be made. First, while responsibility on most campuses technically rests with the several faculties, the appropriate administrator in effect assumes leadership in matters of policy. However, this may not be as universal a process as it appears from limited personal experience, and the great diversity of possible arrangements must again

be called to mind. It is known, for instance, that on one university campus the president's wife happens to take a great personal interest in foreign students and has been able to get all sorts of beneficial things arranged. The second point, which fits with my general philosophy, is that policy governing foreign exchanges at student and faculty levels is quite properly made at those levels and by those individuals who make policy about all students and faculty. When certain questions concerning foreign students arise, the head of the international office, the head of the housing office, directors of special programs for foreign students, and interested and experienced faculty should be gathered for consultation, and decisions made on a consensus reached.

If a professor or a whole department is approached by a government agency to undertake a research and training program involving foreign students, or if the initiative should come from within the faculty, the normal channels appropriate to domestic programs are likely to be generally followed. Somehow I find it difficult to argue the desirability of doing otherwise: if procedures affecting foreign students or programs work reasonably well within the general procedural framework of a campus, there is no reason to change the normal steps of decision making. On the other hand, if a succession of crises involving foreign students or programs occurs on a campus, the president, a vice president, or a dean will soon learn of it and take appropriate steps.

The question of the possible danger to academic standards by taking marginally qualified students is one of the most serious and perplexing ones. There is no use pretending that even in the most selective universities standards are not occasionally relaxed to accommodate foreign students, both in enrolling them and in granting them degrees. In theory every one agrees that this is bad practice, since it undermines the prestige of the institution and of United States higher education in general. In actuality, I believe that the making of certain concessions is widespread and probably unavoidable. For a graduate dean it is impossible to police every course grade or degree issued to a foreign student. In this matter, as in so many others, he must rely on the honesty and good sense of faculty and department chairmen. He can, however, let it be known that foreign students receiving degrees from his institution will be expected to be able to write a literate letter or statement in English, even if the field is engineering or mathematics; and that it is highly embarrassing to an institution to have its graduates go out into the world under false pretenses. But again, as so often in writing this paper, I am struck by the fact that domestic students, too, sometimes receive concessions, and that in

the general academic practice at the graduate level, no explicit, objective standards of measuring academic performance exist. Ultimately, the judgments on students come down to individual or collective faculty opinion, which is always subjective. On every campus there are tough graders and easy graders, and probably foreign-student lovers and haters. It is difficult to imagine a major change in faculty judgments of graduate students without a complete overhaul of graduate education.

Certain policies seem to exist by omission rather than by commission. To a linguist, the parallel between this situation and the concept of "grammar" seems obvious: grammar is not created; it is the systematic presentation of actual language behavior. Foreign student policies on many campuses are not created, I believe. They just happen, and can be explained. This seems to be particularly true of the question of "mix." I know of no cases where a faculty has actually deliberated whether to increase or decrease the percentage of foreign students, though these cases may exist. There is circumstantial evidence, at least, that schools with traditionally high percentages of foreign students, such as M.I.T. and Howard, may for a long time have felt a special obligation to foreign scientists and Africans, respectively; but I doubt that on most campuses this question has become one of policy. Rather, the benefits of admitting and supporting qualified foreign students are such universally accepted dogma that the question is moot. On the other hand it would make an interesting study to determine, given the universal acceptance by universities of *some* responsibilities in international education, who puts how much cash on the line (financial aid to foreign students, campus and community services specially geared to them), and who receives how much income from international education (contracts with the Agency for International Development, Peace Corps, fellowships brought in by foreign students). While international contract research and operations differ widely and may be more heavily concentrated in the major public institutions, the fellowship support for foreign students (as for domestic students) is probably greatest in the major private institutions. But it hardly seems likely that any graduate dean would refuse to commit at least a few tuition fellowships to AFGRAD or the Council of Graduate Schools–Institute of International Education program of screened students from select foreign countries. These programs, incidentally, are perfectly good examples of satisfactory split sponsorships: the home government pays travel, the United States government maintenance, and the individual graduate school, tuition. But the number of students covered by this arrangement is of necessity small.

While presidents and deans have grappled with them I doubt that faculties have often discussed policy questions that might define the university's posture toward certain government agencies or their programs, although recent events may precipitate greater concern along these lines.

My general impression is that the interplay is intensive and generally satisfactory among the universities, the various government agencies with overt international interests, and the facilitating private agencies. The prevailing spirit is one of cooperation among institutions. Annual migration of faculty from campus to campus, and from campus into government, foundations, and internationally oriented agencies and vice versa; the activities of professional organizations like the American Council on Education, the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and of testing organizations like the College Board or Educational Testing Service; the persistent interest of the foundations and the growing educational interests of American industry with overseas interests—all these have created a fairly well-functioning informal network of friendships and information throughout this country. In the constant interweaving of supply and demand for personnel and services in the international area, even the inexperienced administrator can obtain immediate help with one or two judicious long-distance telephone calls. The experienced person usually has a friend to whom he can turn.

Naturally, and quite properly, the various government and private agencies look out for their own interests, as do the universities. Naturally and quite properly they all interpret and reinterpret their respective mandates and missions to see if they still fit changing situations and interests. Naturally and quite properly the graduate schools and their faculties will remain responsive to new international involvements if they are initiated from the outside, and perhaps more so if initiated from within. The question that must always be faced is whether the university can afford a new international program or afford to forego it. The most difficult problem of all on a campus is to maintain balance: between teaching and research, education and public service, domestic involvement and foreign, tradition and innovation. It is my belief that it is the most critical function of a university's higher administration to seek these balances with all the resources at their disposal.

Summary and Recommendations

Let me briefly summarize the salient points.

(1) Foreign students represent 7.2 percent of all graduate students

in the United States. While certain special arrangements for this minority exist and are entirely called for, a survey of several campus problems indicates that in general it may be best to accommodate foreign-student procedures to those used for domestic graduate students.

(2) It is a fruitful concept to regard graduate schools as special cultures, endowed with all the characteristics thereof. Both domestic and foreign students face the difficult problem of bridging the gap between undergraduate and postgraduate study.

(3) The quality of foreignness is not limited to foreign students but besets many domestic students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds.

(4) In order to maintain the independence and integrity of multilateral decision making in the application and selection processes, there is an overriding need for the introduction of a computerized two-way information system. Such a system is seen as having both internal and external advantages to all participating institutions, and to benefit domestic as well as foreign applicants.

(5) Conscious policy formation with respect to foreign graduate students and programs may not be a widely practiced activity on campuses, though there is overwhelming acceptance that a certain percentage of foreign students on campus is a desirable method of discharging the university's responsibility to itself and the world at large.

(6) International relations are likely to be enhanced through student exchanges only if the focus remains on educational objectives, and political considerations are kept in the background. Certain old assumptions about political concomitants to foreign study at graduate and undergraduate levels, and about the community of interests among students, governments, universities, and financial sponsors, should be challenged and restudied, since universities and governments often have divergent interests. Recent developments in this country again corroborate the importance both to their own and to the national interest of universities' maintaining their essential independence.

(7) The brain drain is an ancient phenomenon taking several forms. In its international aspects, it is unlikely to be solved by unilateral actions. A study of its causes, extent, and effects is overdue.

University and Government: Two Views of the Foreign Graduate Student

The sharp increase in international education that has been chronicled, observed, and analyzed during the past two decades, since the end of World War II, has been a particularly notable phenomenon in the United States. Studies such as the Morrill Report and the Nason Report increased the national focus on this matter, which reached its culmination in President Johnson's speech at the Smithsonian centenary in October 1965, and the passage of the International Education Act of 1966.

Despite the interest and attention paid to the many matters subsumed under the general heading of international education, I have seen little devoted to the person who may be the most significant element of the problem and the process—namely, the foreign graduate student. Therefore, I think it is particularly appropriate that a colloquium be conducted on this topic at this time.

I believe there are at least two points of view from which the foreign graduate student can be considered. In the first place, he is a subject of the educational process. From this point of view, it is the university and the educator that have the primary responsibility for his development. The university's primary mandate is to educate; its purpose is to draw out of the student as much as it can of his talent and potential. It must assist him to become himself as fully as possible. Nevertheless, the university does not operate in an ivory tower. It is a product and an exemplar of its time; it operates in a community with spatial, temporal, and social dimensions and cannot escape the responsibilities that history and circumstance thrust upon it.

The foreign graduate student can also be looked upon, however, as a subject of the foreign-policy interests of the United States government. At the very least, the government has expressed this interest by according him a visa. The government is interested in the foreign student as a potential contributor to the development and progress of his country

---

by Daly C. Lavergne
Director, Office of International Training,
Agency for International Development

and as a potential leader in its international and domestic activities. In the portion of the government that I represent, we are especially concerned with the foreign graduate student from this second point of view, in particular with the foreign graduate student from the developing countries, in which the Agency for International Development (AID) operates.

With appreciation, anticipation, and a large measure of humility, therefore, I welcome the opportunity to participate in what I am sure will be a personally and professionally rewarding colloquium.

My appreciation is for the opportunity to represent the Agency for International Development, which has long been engaged in and deeply concerned with international education, the concepts that guide it, and the resources that are helping achieve it.

I approach the meeting with anticipation because I believe that in mutual reexamination and evaluation of our basic premises and policies we can use our hindsight to sharpen our foresight, to establish new or reemphasize existing premises, and to further advance the concepts of international education—responsibilities that we clearly share.

I have a strong feeling of humility because as an individual I have spent a good part of my adult life in this challenging, fascinating, and often frustrating work commonly called economic and social development, with heavy emphasis on education for the needs of newly emerging and developing nations. I have learned firsthand, and sometimes painfully, how complex are the factors at work, how variable the ingredients, how unpredictable the results, and how cautious one must be in generalizing on what constitutes the formula for success. There is, however, one generalization that I can make with deep conviction: the most lasting and rewarding investment that the United States can make in the developing countries and in meeting the demands of a new generation both at home and abroad is that of increased education. To me it also seems apparent that this is a multilateral responsibility and that the results we seek can best be achieved only through close collaboration between the university community and the government.

Much of what I wish to say applies to education generally and higher education in particular, though in this colloquium we are primarily concerned with graduate education. I will concentrate on the latter, but the precepts enunciated will apply to the former, inasmuch as the needs abroad span the spectrum of educational opportunity.

There is, I trust, no question remaining concerning the existing mutual reliance between the government and the university community. The responsibilities of the United States government and the United States

educational community have changed radically in the past 20 years. Each has accepted, sometimes reluctantly, the demand for leadership in international thought and action in its particular sphere. The nature of the changing modern world has brought all of us involved in education to the realization that the term "international education" encompasses much more than the acceptance and education of foreign students in American universities. A new generation of Americans, compelled by circumstance to accept their roles in international leadership, requires special education for the task.

Without sacrificing their basic and traditional responsibility for the advancement of human welfare through the enlargement and communication of knowledge in a spirit of free inquiry, scores of universities have responded to the changed conditions and the new demands. While the degree of participation varies from university to university, it is today a commonplace that American scholars go abroad and that foreign scholars come to United States campuses for study. Many universities have introduced new programs, for both Americans and foreign students, on foreign areas and languages and international relations. Some also have undertaken unprecedented programs of service overseas, assisting educational and public institutions in other countries.

The federal government has encouraged this interest and growth, conceptually and financially. The reasons are clear. In the light of new world responsibilities, it is imperative that Americans think and live internationally. It quickly became apparent that education was and remains increasingly the indispensable ingredient in economic and social development abroad, particularly in the emerging and underdeveloped nations. Development is not basically a material or economic process, though it poses material problems and offers material rewards. It is primarily a political or perhaps a psychological process, a humanist art the function of which is essentially the discovery and nurturing of the latent capabilities of people.

In discussing "The Role of the University in Developing World Community" Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suggests that at least half of the economic growth not directly the result of the traditional inputs of capital, land, and labor is due to improvements in educational levels and manpower skills.[1] One important result of this relationship of skill to

---

1. Speech delivered at the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September 2, 1965.

economic growth is the stronger role of the university as the central supplier of competence.

While research and scholarly achievement measure the current performance of the academic man, the organizing principle of the university remains the instruction of students. The anachronism that results finds academic activity stylized by extensive specialization with an orientation to national and supranational interests. Neal Gross, in a paper entitled "Organizational Lag in Universities," said this: "Although the value and reward system of the university now gives highest priority to the advancement of knowledge among its several objectives, the organizational setup as relates to the great majority of the permanent faculty members in most universities is one that is still basically geared to function as an agency whose primary function is the transmission of knowledge."[2]

The size of the current investment, as for example with the foreign student program, is unclear. But there are clues, to be sure. The Agency for International Development doubled its dollar obligation to American universities from 1961 to 1964; and the number of contracts increased by about the same extent, although the number of universities holding contracts moved in the same period from 58 to only 72.[3] One must nonetheless conclude that substantial support of international effort is being utilized by a relatively small number of institutions. Federal support tends to sustain improvisation for two main reasons: first, educational and research assistance in connection with the developing countries is coupled with international diplomacy and military defense; and second, the legislative practice of debating annually the foreign aid category of the federal budget inclusive of research and education. Accordingly, the quality of federal-university relationships is characterized by action rather than by reflection, and by short-term tactics rather than long-term strategies.

The main purpose in AID's acting to strengthen the universities is not only to serve the national interest, broadly conceived, but to enable these institutions to serve AID itself more effectively, now and in the future. In both the short and long run, AID itself will benefit if the universities gain in their total capacity to deal with the international dimension of their interests.

First, in a manner that few other entities can claim, the university leans

2. *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 33, 1963, p. 63.

3. As of June 30, 1966, contract operations involve 88 universities, holding a total of 107 contracts worth altogether $110 million and assisting 37 different countries.

to the whole view as a principal objective. While it both stores and generates new knowledge, the university also blends knowledge. Such processes are designed to be impersonal, conscious of and even sympathetic to public crisis, yet detached from it. The intramural reflections of the university engender a poise in society while demonstrating the rational and humane qualities of high performance. Such conditions as these processes may require must be arranged largely by the university itself.

In addition to serving as key centers of development in the countries that have them, universities tend to survive and therefore to add continuity amid rapid changes in economic and political life.

Accordingly, since universities share a world-wide ethic that research and scholarship are nonpartisan and nonideological, the future importance of these international dialogues to the hope of a world community is inestimable.

The second area of needed innovation refers to an improvement in the scholarly and research effort of the universities in the international field. Largely because of the agent-client technique of support, the disinclination of federal agencies and other supporting groups to support basic international research, and the lack of interest by the universities in inventing additional techniques of support, it is doubtful that any effort of the American university has emerged with less emphasis on research than the international field.

Robert H. Thayer, former Director of the International Exchange Service of the Department of State, put it this way: ". . . it is impossible to distinguish between the national and the international. One can no longer consider the one without the other. We have moved into a world that is in the process of definition, and we are called upon to be parties to that definition within our historic traditions. The role of the university in specific terms in this new world has not been defined and can only be defined by the universities under the pressure of events and by such intellectually creative work within the universities as will guide events."[4]

The AID legislation (in Section 211 D) provides for a new and important research association with the university community. Designed to assist the AID in a vigorous search for solutions to its most difficult developmental problems abroad, it should not only provide a focus for common action but establish an interdisciplinary framework with which foreign graduate students can become associated in a most relevant way.

A task force is now engaged in selecting AID's highest priority targets

---

4. *Department of State Bulletin*, October 24, 1960, p. 650.

for such study. When these problems have been identified, the institutions will be requested to make proposals on how best to attack them.

We in government must do all we can to assist the university community to think through and implement a growing and effective partnership. Our necessarily pragmatic and time-bound annual view must not deter us from accepting a responsibility, along with the universities, in preserving the vital need of the universities to relate with the broader requirements of the future. Let us resolve not to lose the solutions to "important" problems because we are forced to wrestle with the "urgent" requirements of the present.

Whatever our reasons—altruism or enlightened self-interest (and I am convinced they are both)—we in the federal government have been embarked for many years on substantial programs to assist other nations in achieving economic and social development as a requisite for world peace and stability. This growth must be accomplished within a framework of freedom and democratic thought, for only these can assure optimum development of the individual and his nation. We are, then, concerned with and engaged in the process of political development as well.

Shared Goals

Given the fact that United States leadership in world affairs must and will continue, and that the education of the American people and those of other lands is an essential ingredient of the leadership process, it was inevitable that the government would turn in large measure to the university community to assist in this task. Too much has been said and written of the disparity of objectives between these two vital elements of our national existence. Without belaboring this point, I would deny those voices which contend that the government and the educational community are worlds apart in their objectives, aspirations, and reasons for being; on the contrary, they are reciprocal forces in the same world.

Believing that "education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," as President Kennedy said in a message to Congress on January 29, 1963, and that it is an essential ingredient of both national and international understanding and development, the United States government, particularly through AID sponsorship, has provided education and skills training for tens of thousands of foreign nationals from countries with whom we are working cooperatively to achieve social and economic development.

Approximately half of these foreign nationals have required some academic studies, and AID now, as in the past, depends on the college and

university community to provide these studies. Increasing needs and changing emphases have steadily swelled the academic numbers in recent years. Important to this discussion is the significant fact that the steady trend is toward the provision of more United States graduate studies, as the nations abroad improve their capabilities and develop indigenous institutions for undergraduate education.

During a recent meeting of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) in Chicago it was noted that the graduate school in the United States will come under increasing pressures of enrollment during the next few years, and that since it must rely on the local and state community for a considerable measure of its support, the danger of placing the education of international students lower on the universities' list of priorities than at present is real and imminent. The college admissions official who made these observations believed that only a strong and vigorous dissent to this policy would have any effect. It seems to me that the narrowing of opportunities for foreign students would be tragic and self-defeating in its consequences for the important objectives shared by the universities and the government.

The provision of opportunities for foreign students to study at United States graduate schools is an investment in maturity that will have far-reaching and productive consequences in the years to come. Admittedly, the future has no known constituents, but for this very reason the university must defend against the urgency of time those values and opportunities which will play a crucial role in shaping the future international environment.

To underline the importance of maintaining and expanding these opportunities, let me cite the government's recent policy decision regarding development in Africa. It is now considered wise, in the light of the last few years' experience there, to encourage to the maximum regional answers to many of the problems of human-resources development of the continent. This emphasis is sensible not only from a communication, but also from an economic standpoint. Neither the nations nor the continent as a whole can afford any proliferation of effort when all will be extremely hard pressed in the coming decades to feed the increasing number of hungry mouths that must precede the hoped-for disciplined and serious approach to the problems of family planning.

Recently a task force has canvassed the African universities and identified departments of sufficient quality to warrant sending merit scholars from other African countries; these universities have expressed their interest in making spaces available for such a program. Indeed, the charters

granted most African universities stipulate their responsibility for accepting from 5 to 25 percent of their students from other countries.

It is AID's intent to grant merit scholarships and thus to support the gradual development of African institutions. However, a corollary objective of this program has been to increase the opportunities to study in United States graduate schools. To restrict markedly the enrollment of foreign students at this time would deny this possibility and make the United States university the poorer for having reverted to parochial considerations when the urgent need for greater communication and world understanding is demanding precisely the opposite.

I believe it is wholly consistent that the government and the universities should form and have formed alliances to effect the common objectives in these and other international educational programs. It is a foregone conclusion, acknowledged by the government, that it needs the learned and professional minds of the academic community to assist in the difficult task of fulfilling a meaningful role in development. This is not, however, a one-way street.

The increasing support the government has given to the American university community in recent years has been of mutual value, especially in the area of international education. While the great majority of foreign students, undergraduate or graduate, come to the United States under auspices other than the government, it is apparent that the government's attitude toward international education has greatly influenced the migration to United States campuses. Currently the various programs of government account for fewer than 10,000 of the approximately 90,000 foreign students in the United States, but these programs have done much to communicate to other nations a desirable image of the American political, social, and economic system.

The advantages accruing to the university and its American students as a result of the foreign presence are many and apparent. They need not be detailed here; it is sufficient to say that the benefits of cross-culturalization have rendered a definite and positive influence on most American campuses. That the interest of large segments of the education community coincided with that of the government in recent years is due in part at least to the recognition by universities that the events that have thrust the United States into a substantial role in world leadership provided not only a crisis but also an opportunity for collaboration between the government and the university toward productive purposes. Neither could escape this obligation. As Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Charles Frankel has stated: "Today we have op-

tions with regard to the way in which we ought to define our responsibilities in the rest of the world. But we do not have any option with regard to the question whether we have world responsibilities . . . The same applies to the choices we make in education . . . Whatever we do, however, we make a decision that has not only national but international impact. We shall educate or miseducate for world responsibility. We cannot avoid doing one or the other."[5]

It is, then, a fact that the government has an established and continuing role in education, particularly in international education. For those who feel that government contracts and other forms of assistance to the universities have tended to remove intellectual freedom or educational autonomy from the schools, I would point out, as Secretary Frankel has, that the choice of accepting such aid always remains with the academic community; there is no legal compulsion involved except that of obeying the basic laws of the land. It is shortsighted and erroneous not to recognize that government assistance has provided stimulation, both intellectual and material, to the growth of the university community in recent years. This is not to say, however, that such healthy collaboration has not created some considerable difficulties for the university community. Frank Bowles of The Ford Foundation suggests in pointing up American responsibilities in international education:

"We are having our own educational difficulties, too, in carrying out the commitment. The fact that it is under the policy direction of our government tends to throw educational institutions into a purely technical role, supplying services to fit into a policy which they have not formed. Because it is a program for the strengthening of institutions and systems, individual students become submerged into the anonymity of programs and plans. Hence, our institutions do not, and perhaps cannot, see the whole of the problem with which they are working. This brings up a legitimate question about how an institution-building program can prosper if our own institutions have not been a party to the planning of it, and do not have power of decision in its execution. Another question, equally legitimate, concerns how such a program can be sustained without careful attention to the selection and training of students and younger faculty members, in which our institutions participate.

"The real strength of our system lies in the doctoral programs in our graduate schools, in our advanced professional programs and our research activities. These have made possible the extension of our own

5. *Department of State Bulletin,* July 18, 1966.

higher education, and they are an indispensable resource in our industrial and economic development. They are also, in terms of size, a small portion of our educational structure, which may be one reason why they have scarcely figured in our overseas activities."[6]

AID-*Sponsored Foreign Students*

I have previously stated that United States government sponsorship accounts for fewer than 10 percent of the 90,000 foreign students in the United States. In government programs, the Agency for International Development has brought to the United States more than 85,000 foreign participants over the years. Each year roughly 5,000 new participants arrive for study or training in numerous technical fields. In several years this figure has neared 6,000.

Approximately half of these receive some academic work while here, ranging from a semester of study pertinent to their activity field upward through complete undergraduate work, or graduate studies. About one-third of those pursuing academic studies are at graduate levels. These are programed under the auspices of the AID Office of International Training and exclude some additional hundreds of graduate students brought under direct university-to-university contracts between American and foreign universities. While the latter are AID-sponsored, they are only a small portion of broader services offered under contract by the specific United States university. It is readily apparent that AID has considerable interest in the studies and success of foreign students, including graduate students.

"The objectives of the AID training programs are not only to improve the technical, professional, and managerial skills and knowledge of participants, but also *to introduce attitudes and values* essential to developmental activities, and to *inculcate an appreciation of the need* for social as well as economic growth and to demonstrate insofar as possible that these are inseparable. Conscious effort is made, therefore, to assure exposure to the thinking and living processes possible only in a free and democratic political society."[7]

One of AID's primary objectives is the full-time training of participants selected by AID and the cooperating country for training outside the par-

---

6. "American Responsibilities in International Education." *Educational Record*, Vol. 45, Winter 1964, pp. 19–26.

7. U.S. Congress, House, *Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy: Report No. 2.* 88th Congress, 2nd Session, 1964. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 35. Emphasis added.

ticipant's home country. The purpose of the training is to provide or improve a skill that is needed to accomplish a project objective. Individuals selected for training are employed, or will be employed, on a project for which the training is essential. Participant training in the United States is not arranged when local training resources and facilities are available to meet the training requirements of the project.

It is the intent of AID that the participant devote his best efforts and attention to securing the degree and to completing his academic goal in the shortest possible time, so that he may return to serve his country. Participants seeking degrees are not to compete with United States students for fellowships, nor are they available to fill United States university staff needs.

Each AID-sponsored student, then, is carefully selected for a specific role in his country's development, and his studies are intended to prepare him for this role. He is committed to return upon completion of the initially requested study and use his United States training toward this purpose, teaching others and thus providing the multiplier effect through which his newly acquired knowledge can become more than a personal acquisition. About 50 million dollars is expended by AID annually in the United States for training programs; this figure does not include expenditures abroad and the contributions of other countries for study and training sponsorship.

There are long-standing policies generally governing AID-sponsored training and studies. For academic portions of these programs, AID has consistently for many years turned to United States colleges and universities, using both regular curriculum courses and courses developed especially by various institutions at AID request. While this is but one of the many areas in which government and university collaboration is called for, it is a sizable and continuing one. Participants have been placed primarily for technical studies, consistent with the technical development with which AID is concerned and charged legislatively. This purpose is in contrast to the studies sponsored by the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the programs of which concentrate on the interchange of cultural knowledge rather than acquisition of technical skills.

It is in fields requiring the highest intellectual requirement and skills that AID has looked to United States graduate schools, and there is no doubt that a significant contribution has been made by these institutions. An even greater effort—and greater understanding between the government and universities—will be required in the future as staffing needs of

host-country institutions grow with the increasing demand, and as AID further implements its policy that more undergraduates should receive their studies in their country or in colleges of adjacent nations, reserving United States residence and study for graduate students. President Johnson, in his much quoted Smithsonian address, called for "sharing the wealth" of United States education with peoples abroad, and the government is committed to encouraging and assisting foreign students to seek graduate study here.

AID alone now has foreign students in more than 300 United States colleges and universities, and the new emphases on programs in education, health, and agriculture assure further that the number of foreign graduates seeking United States studies in specialized fields will continue to increase.

Changing Requirements

It seems to be true, then, that the government has a continuing role to play in international education as an integral part of its world role and responsibility, and that the United States education community needs and wants to render its influence on these matters. It would perhaps be well to mention a few of the problems, present or potential, that must be contended with.

Changes in educational philosophies during the past two decades are evident. One result of these changes is the growing acceptance of and responsiveness to government-initiated programs. An increasing portion of the education community has recognized its responsibilities to assist government in its increasingly complex and difficult role. I see this as the natural response by an intellectually free element of society to affect the course of world events as only education can.

The philosophy of foreign aid—including that regarding education and training—has evolved equally over this period. New ideas concerning need for education of the individual beyond his technical specialization have been introduced and have become accepted doctrine. For example, the government now stresses the importance of providing the foreign visitor, including the student, with greater opportunity to meet with Americans, to observe community events and action, to exchange knowledge of cultures. In short, we want him to see our society and to understand better this nation's aims, aspirations, and accomplishments, as well as its social and technical achievements. We endeavor to build this exposure into each training program, and we have enlisted the assistance of colleges and universities to achieve this for our academic participants.

We believe that these opportunities should be made equally available for all foreign students, government-sponsored or not, and that the university community should accept much of the responsibility for effecting this exposure.

There is a growing awareness in the government and in the universities that the unsponsored foreign students, who greatly outnumber at least eight to one those in government programs, constitute a tremendous potential for leadership in their countries and that their attitudes concerning the United States may be vital in their decision-making in the years ahead.

The world is growing increasingly aware of the tragic consequences of the "resource gap," which appears to be expanding, rather than narrowing as was once hoped. The conditions of living and employment are such that the most technically advanced countries will continue to draw from the less advanced, whether the migration is from Europe to the United States, India to Europe, or Sierra Leone to Nigeria. Thus, although the more prosperous nations have the best employment opportunities for the finest intellectual talent, the simple fact is that in the developing nations the professionals constitute the thin sliver of the population that provides leadership. They are the innovators and the catalysts without whom the nation will stagnate. Everybody can subscribe to the ideal of complete intellectual mobility; but the poorer countries of the world cannot successfully discharge their growing responsibilities without getting sufficient skilled human resources with which to build institutions of quality at home. At the same time it cannot come as a surprise that, given the background they came from and their countries' stages of development, so many feel no real sense of social responsibility that would take them home to build for the future.

There is much more to be done in this area, and universities must assure that the student's knowledge of the United States does not begin and end at the campus gate. For AID it is particularly imperative that this objective for its participants be supported by the university, for we are engaged in educating not only skilled technicians, but also leaders who will be responsible for making their countries' future policy and molding public opinion.

The technical means to resolve many of the major problems of mankind already exist. There is no lack of articulation about development, no lack of phrase-makers, theorists and theories, no lack of conferences, institutes, reports, and surveys.

Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers in their *Education, Man-*

power and Economic Growth hold that "The building of modern nations depends upon the development of people and the organization of human activity. Capital, natural resources, foreign aid, and international trade, of course, play important roles in economic growth, but none is more important than manpower."[8]

What appears to be lacking is people who can translate these aspirations and demands into something tangible in the lives of their countrymen. The future leader must be provided with a knowledge that is broader, more comprehensive, and more sensitive to the human personality than the knowledge he can now acquire. He must be provided with the chief art of the dynamics of change—the understanding and the inspiration by which men are moved to action. The primary skill required is human, not technical; education must be considered in terms of human personality and the intangible quality of leadership. Failure to recognize potential leadership talent and to motivate able people often account in large measure for faltering progress in economic development abroad. Economic development is not a viable goal without political development; and political development, as John Plank puts it, in the last analysis is something that occurs in people. I would strongly endorse this statement after extensive service overseas, during which I have become convinced that the talent for educational development is present in every society.

This is not to suggest that supermen are needed; on the contrary, the leadership potential is already enormous. It must be found, nurtured, motivated, and encouraged. Ways must be found to bring about a general realization of the need to emphasize more the humanist qualities required for development. In those universities which have chosen to engage in the tasks of international affairs, including acceptance of foreign students, recognition of and intensified action toward fulfilling these requirements is vital.

In speaking here of "the education community" we are actually speaking only of those colleges and universities which have elected to be a part of this grand enterprise. Many have not, and it would be erroneous to assume that the entire education community has accepted an international role. In truth, many universities are not now qualified to do so. The Morrill report of December 1960, *The University and World Affairs* (issued by a committee drawn from universities, industry, and the government), warned that universities should not undertake such involvement unless

---

8. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964, p. v.

they are willing to revamp and improve their facilities, curriculums, and approach to the task.[9]

The same report recommended that "all American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs," and "should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions."

Some universities, particularly their graduate schools, have become deeply involved in international affairs and in the inherent cooperation with the government that this involves. Others have not. The Institute of International Education reports that 10 universities (California, New York, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania State, Harvard, Columbia, and Howard) have 20 percent of the 90,000 foreign students in the United States. The University of California has the largest number, 4,535; but Howard University has the highest percentage, 14.4 percent (1,139 foreign students out of a total enrollment of 7,906).

Some universities are compelled by their state legislature to limit acceptance of foreign students in order to provide for state residents. Others feel that they are inadequate to the task. Regrettably, it appears that many are not yet willing to face the issues that the realities of international events have thrust upon them, or are deterred by fears of government intervention and control. Still others are unwilling to adjust curricular offerings to meet the study needs of foreign students. In this connection the Morrill report said: "It is no longer possible for universities to regard their foreign students (and particularly those from outside North America and Western Europe) as no different from American students. Curricular offerings must often be redesigned to meet the distinctive needs of foreign students and the nations from which they come. At the same time, special efforts have to be made not to isolate the foreign students either in their course work or their extracurricular life. . . . Special efforts should be undertaken, going considerably beyond what is implied by 'hospitality,' to give them an acceptable and satisfying place in student and community life."

It is our contention that there is a mission involved and that the sense of this mission should be accepted by a much larger segment of the American university community. This is what I meant by suggesting at

---

9. Committee on the University and World Affairs, J. C. Morrill, Chairman. New York: The Ford Foundation, 84 pp.

the beginning of this paper that we in the government see two angles from which to view the foreign graduate student. For the professional educator he is a subject of the educational process with all that that implies. To us he is also a subject of foreign policy consideration whether he is government-sponsored or not. He is of interest to us as a future leader of thought, opinion, and development in his country, and the United States government feels a legitimate concern for the type of education he receives in this country and its usefulness to him after he returns to his country.

While the university's primary mandate is to educate, it must, like other portions and instruments of society, perform its function within the total confines of the world community. More perhaps than any other American institution, the university must live, and teach, and be sensitive to the context of its times. The world of 25 years ago is hardly recognizable today; the days of unilateral living and decision-making are past. There are few actions engaged in by other nations—political, military, or cultural—that do not impinge on the life and thought of Americans today. The reverse, of course, applies to an even greater and growing degree.

It follows logically that the university must concern itself with the needs, views, and actions of the government, the instrument charged with representing the multiple interests of the people. Adequate knowledge of international affairs is both necessary and desired, and the people are turning in increasing numbers to the universities to provide the requisites of international education. In the difficult task of revamping facilities and curricular content to meet this demand, the university need not and should not do violence to its raison d'etre. On the other hand, it can no longer fulfill its responsibility to society by teaching within the comfortable confines of the past, rather than the turbulent and challenging context of the present. It is fitting that the university community and those of us with some contribution to make to its functions should examine its effectiveness and seek ways to strengthen it.

Stephen K. Bailey says "There is more shadow than substance to international education today in all of its various meanings. We are doing far too little to orient man to his global context; and what we do do along these lines is frequently misguided, misplaced, or woefully short of the mark.

"In all too many cases, foreign students are brought to the United States without proper advanced screening and without adequate institutional and social guidance during their stay. Furthermore colleges and

universities vacillate between a single standard of academic toughness and a fuzzy and unstructured dual standard of leniency for foreign students. In many institutions a hesitant foreign accent or a limited English style or vocabulary is worth 10 percentage points on any final examination. We have not really sorted out the special levels and academic flexibilities needed to handle the peculiar gradations of background which we blithely import by the tens of thousands."[10]

Although there may be some truth in some places regarding this picture of reality, it should be made clear that the government does not suggest that United States graduate schools either admit or graduate foreign students on the basis of lowered standards. Neither does it suggest that a foreign student be accepted in place of a United States student, or that a foreign graduate student be favored with respect to financial aid. But it does suggest that curriculum adjustments be made to the maximum extent possible to meet specific needs.

The system devised to maximize the opportunities for effective study in the graduate schools will hardly be defensible in the eyes of history if an atomic scientist goes to a hostile country because no one in the United States system cares about him as an individual. Policy is determined for the gross number, but its application must be tested by the extent to which it is relevant to the needs of the individual.

There is increasing recognition that foreign graduate students' studies should be tailored more closely to the needs of their countries and environments. This is a significant difference that has distinguished AID-sponsored participants, academic and other, from other foreign graduate students through the years. The AID participant comes to the United States for training or study related to a specific need or stipulated long-range developmental goals of his nation. Unlike the unsponsored foreign student, personal preferences, for example, or pursuance of the arts are not espoused. His studies, particularly at the graduate level, are of highly technical nature, intended to serve the developmental objectives of his country. There has been much demonstrated reluctance on the part of many college and university personnel to accept the concept that job success after the student returns to his country should be a major criterion in study planning for AID participants. Yet without recognition and acceptance of this criterion, the AID participant has no valid reason for AID's sponsorship. The entire purpose of AID is nation-building, in-

---

10. *International Education: Shadow and Substance.* Annual School of Education Spring Lecture, Cornell University, April 30, 1963. Mimeographed.

cluding study and training to build indigenous corps of skilled personnel in the cooperating countries.

We are concerned with fulfilling specific manpower requirements within the shortest possible time; and, consistent with the provision of quality instruction, the participant is expected to gain the agreed-upon knowledge and skills and return to his country. The occasional effort made by colleges and universities to obtain extensions for AID participants to remain and pursue additional studies, often for added degrees, is usually inconsistent with the program's objectives. Too often in the past this kind of extension has resulted in longer stays, training in excess of need, and subsequent disappointment for the student when he returns home and finds that he is overqualified for the job for which training was requested. In other instances it has doubtless contributed to the participant's desire and efforts to remain permanently in the United States and seek employment here.

In this connection, the Education and World Affairs booklet, *The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?*, issued in 1964, states: "It is argued by some that admissions should not be exclusively tied to manpower priorities. Such a rigid policy would rule out gifted individuals from developing their talents in a variety of fields, such as philosophy and the arts, that may not be high in a developing nation's scheme of priorities. Concern is expressed, nevertheless, about the large number of students from abroad who train themselves in fields for which they have no special calling and whose training does not seem to render them eligible for positions upon returning.

"The issue of manpower priorities is likely to be more acute in graduate and professional education than in the undergraduate education. Costs are higher, resources are more limited, and the needs of developing countries are more sharply defined in the specialized fields. But this raises questions about the particular programs available in the American university. The graduate school must consider not only the availability of a place for the foreign applicant in the particular field for which he is applying but also the relevance of the program to the applicant's purpo[illegible]. It is frequently found that the graduate and professional training given foreign students is unrealistic in terms of the conditions they encounter when they return to their home country. For example, in some cases the equipment they have learned to use is not available. In others, the level of development of the art or science makes other knowledge more necessary than that gained in the United States.

"Raising these questions is not meant to suggest that a graduate school

should apply criteria rigidly in deciding on the admission of foreign students. But these are the kinds of questions to be considered in arriving at reasoned decisions."[11]

This statement is particularly appropriate when applied to AID academic participants at any level. We are convinced, moreover, that the university community must begin to apply such criteria in considering acceptance of any foreign student. The growing demands being placed on the American education system to provide education for Americans, as well as many other factors influencing the growth and capabilities of the colleges and universities, will steadily enforce such consideration. In addition, other countries are beginning to question seriously the logic of permitting their nationals to go abroad for courses that will have little or no relationship to the pressing exigencies of their national development.

Great concern has been expressed in recent years concerning the brain drain—the siphoning of trained and educated minds from the lesser to the more developed nations. I need not attempt here to delineate the reasons why highly skilled nationals from abroad, and particularly those educated in the Northern Hemisphere, elect to seek permanent residence or citizenship in the United States or other developed nations. The attractions of higher income and improved living standards, as well as professional opportunity, are high on the list of appeals. But the less developed countries look askance at the United States and other developed nations as their best-trained scientists and technicians emigrate to more lucrative and satisfying opportunities.

James Perkins, the President of Cornell University, wrote in the July 1966 issue of *Foreign Affairs:* ". . . One of the gravest problems facing the underdeveloped world is the fact that all too many of its best-trained men and women leave home and never return to the departments of agriculture or the schools or the hospitals. If we accept the fact that those who climb the ladder of change are a minority at best, that the climb was difficult, and that the presence of these people determines whether or not a foreign assistance program will succeed, then we must understand that it is far more critical for the less developed world to lose them than it is for the more developed world to gain them. Yet it is just this loss we not only countenance but encourage. While with one hand we give laboratory equipment, train teachers, send our own teachers, build buildings—all on the very simple propositions that the modernization of the underdeveloped world is in our immediate and demonstrated self-interest and

11. New York: Education and World Affairs, pp. 15–17.

that the critical component of a modernizing society is its modernizing man—with the other hand we take away not only the raw materials but the very people who have been so carefully trained to develop them."[12]

This succinct summation describes well our attitudes and highlights a problem that has become a major concern of many United States educators. Much research on this problem has been undertaken recently by the government, the university world, and private organizations; all are seeking data and solutions to this matter, which may be nearing the crisis stage for some nations. The Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs has just completed a study of the problem of the migration of talent and skills. It would appear from the study's supporting charts that the problem of migration does not involve the large numbers that have been previously quoted and that it is a problem difficult to generalize about. Of the 64 Missions polled about the seriousness of the problem, 45 have so far responded that there is no numerically significant drain at this time. However, it may still be a real and pressing difficulty for at least 19 countries and is still worthy of serious concern and action. It should be noted, moreover, that in the least developed countries the loss of a few skilled resources can deeply and adversely affect development potential. Several members of the United States Congress have become concerned, and legislation was introduced in the late days of the 89th Congress to help alleviate the problem. Foremost among these pieces of legislation was that of Senator Walter F. Mondale, whose bill would compel foreign students, regardless of sponsorship, to return to their countries and devote some years of their work effort there before being allowed to return to the United States for any purpose. A similar measure has been introduced into the House by Congressman Donald M. Fraser.

The seriousness of this problem may very well evoke some form of Congressional legislation in the near future. Meanwhile, however, we feel that the problem can be reduced somewhat—and, indeed, could have been minimized previously—if colleges and universities had seriously considered the relationship of foreign students' study to the manpower requirements of the nations from which they came. Continuing concern with this matter is a requisite as the university community adjusts to its role in international affairs.

It has been my purpose in this paper to describe the government's interest in the foreign graduate student as an aspect of foreign relations and

---

12. "Foreign Aid and the Brain Drain." Pp. 608–619.

especially of international development policy. As I said in the beginning, we fully recognize that the university community has at least as large a stake in this matter as we do, since the foreign graduate student is also the subject of the educational process. Our role as we now see it is primarily in the field of development—political, economic, and social. In order to fulfill this role, we rely heavily on the education community.

It must already be obvious to many who now sit upon committees and councils of so many kinds that the government looks to and needs the learned and professional minds of the university community to assist it in the difficult task of fulfilling a meaningful role in development. In coming to a new level of understanding and partnership between the government and the graduate schools we greatly need to improve the process of communication between us. I feel that we in the government have not yet fully realized the rich planning resources that exist in the country's graduate schools. More should be done to involve the university much earlier in the training and development process so that participation can carry with it the enthusiasm and dedication which comes only with involvement from the beginning. We would welcome, on the other hand, an opportunity to become more intimately acquainted with the aspirations, the plans, and the problems of the graduate school community so that we may anticipate and resolve many problems before they become urgent and serious.

I trust that the dialogue stimulated by this colloquium will continue. It is a good step forward.

An Appraisal of the Behavior of Universities in International Education

The two decades since World War II have marked the transition of the American university to a position of many dimensions and critical importance in the field of international affairs. It has, of course, always been part of their charter, as with universities worthy of the name everywhere, to assert universality of interest in the pursuit and transmission of knowledge. But the transition of which I speak in these recent years is more than a difference in degree; it involves changes not yet fully apparent in the basic behavior patterns of the American university as an institution. Colloquy about these questions of what is happening and what ought to happen in the evolving role of the university in international affairs has hardly kept pace with the fact of change itself.

Much of the rapid evolution in the international role of the university has been forced by pressures from outside the university—the kind of pressures that in some measure have affected the entire fabric of current times for the citizenry of the United States. As a country, we have been swept to a position of world leadership and influence that has made demands on both public and private institutions and has subjected the quality of their behavior to the intimate view of people everywhere.

It is the quality of this behavior in the university that I propose to examine. Surely we are at a point in time when we can expect to develop in some more systematic way an idea of the appropriate role of the university in world affairs. As one who has during most of this post-World War II period been with the universities in their international education activity—if not a part of them—I mean to suggest a framework and a set of values that may be relevant in the further development of university functions in international education.

The foremost responsibility of the university, I take it, is to create an environment in which students and scholars can seek truth and meaning in forms pertinent to the welfare of men and the quality of their lives. The emphasis here is on the problem of the university's maintaining rele-

---

by Albert G. Sims
Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board

vance to the society in which it exists and to the direction and pace of change in that society. In this sense, there can be no dichotomy between the university and the "real world," because if the university is not the liveliest point for the focus of concern with the real world, then it has lost its functional uniqueness as an institution.

Some, such as Glenn Olds, the former executive dean of international studies and world affairs at the State University of New York, believe that the universities are undergoing their own "identity crisis" in these terms. There can be little doubt, as he has pointed out, that some part of the ferment among students arises from a growing awareness of a world pressing in on them, larger and different from anything they are being formally prepared to expect. It becomes evident that no educated man will know his own identity with the perspective and conviction he will require unless his orientation breaks from the parochialism that has characterized education everywhere, including the United States.

The university has available to it all the connections that need to be strengthened for this purpose—through study and research, especially on an interdisciplinary basis, in a context relevant to the present and prospective condition of man; through study abroad; through foreign students; through the visits of foreign faculty; and through the varied opportunities for United States faculty for service overseas. It is through the strengthening of all these connections with "the real world" that, I contend, the university fulfills its primary obligation to be at the center of man's concern for his future.

Another important function of the universities in this sphere is to serve as a pool of indispensable resource for the government and other organizations in international education. This is the source to which these agencies must turn for the conduct of their affairs. The specific relationships involved are mainly from the government to the individual in the university or to professional organizations in the academic community. The role of the university as an institution is to set the terms under which the people in the pool will be released for this kind of service. Although the movement of personnel to and from government is sizable, it is still apparent that the ground rules in the universities for this movement vary widely and usually entail some sacrifice or some insecurity for the individuals concerned.

The procession of people moving from universities to government in this path serve the government in numerous ways: some are advisers and consultants in the development of policies, and here the migration of people from the universities to the Washington scene, while fluctuating

somewhat with the climate of administrations, is nevertheless a growing phenomenon increasingly nurturing a way of life in academe; some provide consultation and assistance for operational programs—the relationship of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers to the Agency for International Development (AID) in the evaluation, selection, and placement of AID participant trainees comes to mind as a case in point; some involve limited-term appointments for overseas program operations—appointments to foreign university faculties are illustrative. Incidentally, some foreign universities have found it easier to accommodate American faculty on this basis, rather than an institution-to-institution basis, since it tends to avert the tension that often develops between local faculty and administration, on the one hand, and the emissary "team" with its dual loyalties to foreign and United States institutions.

Another prominent engagement of the American university in international affairs is as an agency for providing services requested by the government through contract. For the last decade, this has been the edge of the knife cutting the universities into a distinctive, larger sphere of operation with the government in international education activity. It has been a mixed blessing for both parties, as is well known. It has propelled faculty members in the larger universities in sizable numbers into the intricate business of educational development. And it has helped create a breadth of knowledge and sophistication in the American universities, undoubtedly making them both more relevant and more exciting as institutions.

But the scheme has also had its drawbacks. It has provoked a persistent contest about what are fair bases for calculating reimbursement for such services, with many lances being broken in the never-never land of overhead. It has stimulated the hiring by universities of faculty for contract purposes, sometimes without the usual scruples for quality and often without calculation of how these new faculty could be institutionally integrated except by the further search for more contracts. It has fostered competition among some institutions for a specious kind of prestige on the assumption that a great university must have a big international involvement and that the road to greatness is paved with AID contracts and foundation grants; with this rationale have come a breed of drummers for university contracts to sell their wares in the Washington scene. It has revealed what should have been obvious from the beginning: that the university as an institution has no natural, functional capacity for the operation of projects overseas.

Those who argue that the service-oriented tradition of United States higher education naturally fits the university for project operation overseas misinterpret that tradition and experience, I believe. The land-grant universities have had an orientation of education and training in the mechanical and agricultural arts to meet the needs of the community. Charles Eliot of Harvard and others helped cast a mold for the university responsive and responsible to the community in which it exists, and this tradition has indeed developed as a distinctive attribute of United States higher education. It has not been a part of this tradition, however, that the universities should be a major instrumentality for the creation or reform of institutions in the community. Indeed, when educational institutions aspire to become such instrumentalities for planning and executing social reform, their very birthright is put in jeopardy. For no institution can maintain the independence necessary for research and for the ordering of knowledge about the total society and at the same time be engaged in social or political action. Some, I know, would have the universities so committed because, in their view, this is the only way for a university to do its part in confronting the great challenges of this day: the redress of poverty, the humanizing of the big cities, the battle for civil rights, and so forth. All these problems are of course of utmost importance to the universities, but in terms of inquiry rather than social action.

The same vein of argument infects the question of whether the university should be a policy partner with the government in the planning and development of international education programs. No one, I think, can doubt that there should be close consultation between the government and the universities when the government sponsors programs that require university collaboration. The AFGRAD program, with which the Council of Graduate Schools is associated, is an example; others are the AID participant training program and the Fulbright program. The same close cooperative planning is needed when the universities themselves sponsor programs for which government assistance is a prerequisite, as in the case of the ASPAU and LASPAU programs for Africa and Latin America, respectively. Finally, it is evident that joint planning and consultation is important for programs designed to strengthen the general capacity of the universities in international education, as is the case with Section 211.D of Title II of the Foreign Aid Act of 1966 and the International Education Act of the same year. Specific provision is made for such consultation in the implementation of the International Education Act through stipulation in the law for the establishment of an advisory committee.

The argument (and problem) comes with the question of what function the universities have in making and executing general policy for international education in the United States national interest. I do not mean the policy of the federal government with respect to the financial support of colleges and universities for strengthening their educational programs, including those with an international education dimension. I mean foreign policy that embraces international education as a component activity and as a part of the larger design for promoting United States interests through orderly social and economic development abroad. C. W. DeKiewiet, in his recent paper on "Government, the Universities, and International Affairs: The Common Responsibilities," says: "The proper role of American universities and American assistance is to sustain and encourage national plans or strategies of development."[1]

If "the American universities" in this context means "academia," the statement can be taken as credible even though expansive. If, however, the phrase is to be taken literally—American universities as institutions have this role to perform—the statement is, in my judgment, nonsense. No government can accede to such a role for its universities; and no university could aspire to competence for the task without unwarranted pretension and perversion of its central purpose; and the universities collectively have no mechanism for registering a common voice on such matters even if their competence were to be assumed.

The government-to-university or foundation-to-university relationship is not the only form in which the university as an institution becomes implicated in activities overseas. However amorphous the community internationally, the American university quite properly identifies itself in common interest with other universities around the world. Regional organizations of universities do exist in Europe, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere in various stages of development and effectiveness. The International Association of Universities provides the framework for overall organization. None of these patterns for institutional association has been knit as closely on an international basis as the structures for many professional associations. Some part of the reason for this may be that the university in its various manifestations around the world is inevitably an integral part of a national institutional system, with the restraints such status implies. Nevertheless, if the American university is to divest itself of its parochialism, it can hardly avoid a more active role of

---

1. In Shiver, Elizabeth (editor), *Higher Education in Public and International Services.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

leadership among the universities of the world than it has so far chosen to exercise.

In this view of the role of the universities in international education, I have tried to stress the primacy of the task of strengthening the universities as educational institutions in a world in which the meaningful interconnections are increasingly and pervasively international. I have held it important to promote fluidity in movement of personnel between the university and the government sectors because the universities represent a resource of depth in knowledge and skills on which the success of the United States government in international affairs heavily depends. I have frankly discounted the validity of the concept underlying typical government contracts with the universities for institutional development or reform overseas because, it seems to me, the universities by their nature are not suited for these purposes and because the pursuit of government contracts has tended to undermine their quality as educational institutions. Likewise, acceptance by the universities of a responsibility with government in the formulation and execution of foreign policy strategies with respect to education or other fields leads down the Camelot trail to their seduction. On the other hand, there are forms of partnership between universities, individually and collectively, and the government that are both necessary and useful. In the largest perspective, the most productive form of government assistance to the universities in international education can be realized through financial aid to these institutions that will strengthen them for their tasks as educational institutions in the modern world.

The strength and the usefulness of the relationship between the universities and the government derive from their essential differences—not, as some would have us believe, from their growing similarities. The polarity of power attracts energetic men and institutions. The government is of course the seat of power in our society. The danger in this for the universities is that they may perceive themselves as some natural extension of the national interest for which the government is the apparatus. If this were to become their self-perception, they would surely forfeit the quality of their independence that is the only ground on which education worthy of the name can flourish.

Participants in the Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student March 30-31, 1967[1]

W. P. Albrecht
Dean, The Graduate School
University of Kansas

Daniel Alpert
Dean, The Graduate College
University of Illinois

F. N. Andrews
Dean, Graduate School
Purdue University

E. James Archer
Dean, Graduate School
University of Colorado

Richard Armitage
Dean, Graduate School
The Ohio State University

Robert H. Baker
Dean, Graduate School
Northwestern University

Rev. Paul E. Beichner, c.s.c.
Dean, The Graduate School
University of Notre Dame

Neal R. Berte
Assistant Director
Midwestern Regional Office
College Entrance Examination Board

Joseph E. Black
Director, Humanities and
Social Sciences
The Rockefeller Foundation

Francis M. Boddy
Associate Dean, Graduate School
University of Minnesota

Howard S. Bretsch
Associate Dean, Horace H. Rackham
School of Graduate Studies
The University of Michigan

William J. Burke
Dean, Graduate College
Arizona State University

Lattie Coor
Assistant Dean, Graduate School of
Arts and Sciences
Washington University

James M. Davis
Vice President
Institute of International Education

Rev. Walter J. Feeney, S.J.
Dean, Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences
Boston College

Melvin J. Fox
Associate Director, International
Training and Research Program
The Ford Foundation

Rev. Lawrence W. Friedrich, S.J.
Dean, Graduate School
Marquette University

Anthony B. Giordano
Dean of Graduate Studies
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn

Max Goodrich
Dean, Graduate School
Louisiana State University

Maurice Harari
Vice President
Education and World Affairs

---

1. Affiliations shown are those that were current at the time of the colloquium.

Marita T. Houlihan
Coordinator for Student Activities
Office of U. S. Programs and Services
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
Department of State

Harold Howe
Dean, Graduate School
Saint Louis University

Stirling L. Huntley
Director of Admissions
Stanford University
(representing NAFSA)

Putnam F. Jones
Dean of the Graduate Faculty
University of Pittsburgh

Bryant Kearl
Associate Dean, Graduate School
University of Wisconsin

Patricia Kinghorn
Administrative Assistant
College Entrance Examination Board

Robert E. Kinsinger
Director, Division of Education and Public Affairs
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

John L. Landgraf
Associate Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
New York University

Richard O. Lang
International Division
S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

Daly C. Lavergne
Director, Office of International Training
Agency for International Development

Charles T. Lester
Dean, Graduate School
Emory University

Brigham D. Madsen
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Utah

Carroll L. Miller
Dean, Graduate School
Howard University

John Perry Miller
Dean, Graduate School
Yale University

Forrest G. Moore
Adviser to Foreign Students
University of Minnesota
(representing NAFSA)

Milton E. Muelder
Dean, Graduate School
Michigan State University

Rev. Joseph F. Mulligan, S.J.
Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Fordham University

E. Jefferson Murphy
Executive Vice President
The African-American Institute

James C. Olson
Dean of the Graduate College
The University of Nebraska

J. Boyd Page
Dean of the Graduate College
Iowa State University

Michael J. Pelczar Jr.
Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research
University of Maryland

W. J. Peterson
Dean, Graduate School
North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Herbert D. Rhodes
Dean, Graduate College
University of Arizona

Carl D. Riggs
Dean, Graduate School
University of Oklahoma

Eric Rodgers
Dean, Graduate School
University of Alabama

Elizabeth Shiver
Assistant to the Director
Commission on International Education
American Council on Education

William E. Simeone
Dean, Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Albert G. Sims
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

S. D. Shirley Spragg
Dean, University Council on Graduate Studies
University of Rochester

D. C. Spriestersbach
Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College
University of Iowa

George P. Springer
Dean, Graduate School
The University of New Mexico

Frayn Utley
Director, Midwest Office
Institute of International Education

Theodore Vestal
Assistant (International Education) to the Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Clyde Vroman
Director of Admissions
The University of Michigan
(representing AACRAO)

Nathan L. Whetten
Dean, Graduate School
University of Connecticut

Henrietta Wilson
The Graduate College
University of Washington